

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action mailed October 21, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 3, 13, and 18 are hereby amended. Claims 14 and 15 were previously canceled. No claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-13, and 16-21 are currently pending for prosecution on the merits. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**Claims 1- 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,839,097 to Klausner (hereinafter “*Klausner*”).** *Office Action* at p. 2. Applicants traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a monitoring device connected to the plurality of home appliances wirelessly or via a cable to transmit and receive data to and from at least one of the plurality of home appliances; and a remote controller connected to the monitoring device wirelessly to transmit and receive data to control an operation of at least one of the plurality of home appliances, the monitoring device comprising: an infrared communication module that transmits and receives data to and from the remote controller ... wherein the monitoring device is located together with the remote controller at a place which is separated from where the plurality of home appliances are located.” *Klausner* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, at least these features of the claimed invention.

The Office purports that *Klausner* discloses “a monitoring device (17) connected to the plurality of home appliances by a cable to transmit data to the appliances” and “a remote controller (26) wirelessly connected to the monitoring device and transmit data to the monitoring device for controlling the appliances.” *Office Action* at p. 3. *Klausner* discloses “only an IR receiver 24 with the control then taking place via an IR remote control device 26” where “the IR receiver 24 only comprises an IR decoder for converting the received IR signals into bus telegrams.” *Klausner* at col. 5:23-25 and Fig. 2. Thus, *Klausner* only discloses an IR receiver to receive signals from the remote controller. Accordingly, even if one of ordinary skill in the art construed *Klausner*’s control computer 17 as the monitoring device recited in the claims,

*Klausner* fails to disclose, expressly or inherently “the monitoring device comprising: an infrared communication module that transmits and receives data to and from the remote controller,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Further, *Klausner* discloses that the “control computer 17 is positioned or plugged in at a plug-in slot 18 ... of the dishwasher 14.” *Klausner* at co. 4:19-21 and Fig. 2. In contrast, Applicants claim 1 recites that “the monitoring device is located together with the remote controller at a place which is separated from where the plurality of home appliances are located.” Thus, *Klausner* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, all of the features recited in independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 1. Claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

**Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Klausner* in view of UK Publication No. 2265158 to Ioku (hereinafter “*Ioku*”).** *Office Action* at p. 3. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

*Ioku* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Klausner* with respect to independent claim 1. *Ioku* discloses that “[t]he transmitter 4 is further provided with ... a display section 43 serving as signal delivery display means for flashing several times ... when the contents of a washing operation set by the above-described various key switches and the operation knob 38 are transferred to the washing machine by means of infrared rays radiated from a light-emitting section 42.” *Ioku* at p. 6 lines 18-23. In other words, *Ioku*’s transmitter displays when the operations are transferred to the washing machine, *Ioku* is entirely silent regarding any teaching or suggestion concerning “a monitoring device connected to the plurality of home appliances wirelessly or via a cable to transmit and receive data to and from at least one of the plurality of home appliances; and a remote controller connected to the monitoring device wirelessly to transmit and receive data to control an operation of at least one of the plurality of home appliances, the monitoring device comprising: an infrared communication module that transmits and receives data to and from the remote controller,” as recited in independent claim 1. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element

of claims 6 and 7, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6 and 7.

**Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Klausner* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0097851 to Daum et al. (hereinafter “*Daum*”).** *Office Action* at p. 4. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

*Daum* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Klausner* with respect to independent claim 1. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Daum* to purportedly disclose “the use of power line modem for the transmission and reception of control signals for an appliance.” *Office Action* at p. 4. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 8-10, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 8-10.

**Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Klausner* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,510 to Song et al. (hereinafter “*Song*”).** *Office Action* at p. 5. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

*Song* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Klausner* with respect to independent claim 1. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Song* to purportedly disclose “a monitoring device wirelessly connected to a communication device ... over a power line network.” *Office Action* at p. 5. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 11-12, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 11-12.

**Claims 13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Song* in view of *Klausner*.** *Office Action* at p. 5. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 13 is allowable over *Song* in view of *Klausner* in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a monitoring device for monitoring an operation state of a home appliance, the monitoring device installed remotely from the home appliance, wherein the monitoring device includes an infrared communication module that

transmits and receives data; a remote controller for wirelessly transmitting and receiving data to and from the monitoring device.” As admitted by the Office, “*Song* is silent on teaching the monitoring device receive signal from a remote control.” *Office Action* at p. 6. Thus, *Song* does not teach or suggest at least these features of claim 13.

*Klausner* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Song*. As stated above, *Klausner* discloses “only an IR receiver 24 with the control then taking place via an IR remote control device 26” where “the IR receiver 24 only comprises an IR decoder for converting the received IR signals into bus telegrams.” *Klausner* at col. 5:23-25 and Fig. 2. Thus, *Klausner* only discloses an IR receiver to receive signals from the remote controller. Accordingly, *Klausner* fails to teach or suggest “a monitoring device for monitoring an operation state of a home appliance, the monitoring device installed remotely from the home appliance, wherein the monitoring device includes an infrared communication module that transmits and receives data; a remote controller for wirelessly transmitting and receiving data to and from the monitoring device,” as recited in independent claim 13. Accordingly, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features recited in independent claim 13.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 13. Claims 16 and 17 depend from independent claim 13. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

**Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Song* and *Klausner* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0175828 to Macey (hereinafter “*Macey*”).** *Office Action* at p. 6. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 18 is allowable over *Song* and *Klausner* in view of *Macey* in that claim 18 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “turning on a monitoring device and displaying a state of the home appliance thereon, the monitoring device located at a place which is separated from where the plurality of home appliances are located; inputting an operation condition of the home appliance through a remote controller, the remote controller located at the same place as where the monitoring device is located ... displaying an operation state of the home appliance on the monitoring device and transmitting with an infrared module the operation state of the home appliance to the remote controller.” As admitted by the Office, “*Song* is silent on teaching the monitoring device receive signal from a remote control” and

“*Klausner* is silent on teaching transmitting the operating state of the appliance to the remote control.” *Office Action* at p. 7. Thus, *Song* and *Klausner* does not teach or suggest at least these features of claim 18.

*Macey* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Song* and *Klausner*. *Macey* discloses a two-way RF remote control where “[t]he remote control has a display and an antenna for transmitting signals to the spa and for receiving signals back from the spa.” *Macey* at Abstract. In contrast, Applicants claim “displaying an operation state of the home appliance on the monitoring device and transmitting with an infrared module the operation state of the home appliance to the remote controller.” Thus, *Macey* does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 18. Accordingly, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features recited in independent claim 18.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 18. Claims 19-21 depend from independent claim 18. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

### **CONCLUSION**

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 21, 2009

By: Rosland S. Pelline (Reg. No. 60,164)  
for Michael I. Angert  
Registration No. 46,522  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant